arXiv:1511.05982v1 [cond-mat.soft] 18 Nov 2015

Mobility Measurements Probe Conformational Changes in Membrane Proteins due to Tension

Richard G. Morris and Matthew S. Turner
Department of Physics and Centre for Complexity Science, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK.

The function of membrane-embedded proteins such as ion channels depends crucially on their conformation. We demonstrate how conformational changes in asymmetric membrane proteins may be inferred from measurements of their diffusion. Such proteins cause local deformations in the membrane, which induce an extra hydrodynamic drag on the protein. Using membrane tension to control the magnitude of the deformations and hence the drag, measurements of diffusivity can be used to infer— via an elastic model of the protein— how conformation is changed by tension. Motivated by recent experimental results [Quemeneur *et al.*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, **111** 5083 (2014)] we focus on KvAP, a ubiquitous voltage-gated potassium channel. The conformation of KvAP is found to change considerably due to tension, with its 'walls', where the protein meets the membrane, undergoing significant angular strains. The torsional stiffness is determined to be $26.8\,k_BT$ at room temperature. This has implications for both the structure and function of such proteins in the environment of a tension-bearing membrane.

PACS numbers: 87.14.ep; 87.15.hp; 47.63.-b

Recently, Quemeneur *et al.* [1] measured how the diffusion of KvAP was affected by membrane tension. KvAP is an example of a protein that is found to have an affinity for curved membranes [2], implying an asymmetric, cone-like shape. The protein induces a localised deformation, or 'dimple', in the membrane, the magnitude (and extent) of which decreases as the applied tension is increased. To investigate the effect of shape on dynamics, the authors of [1] traced the motion of KvAP at different membrane tensions and compared the corresponding diffusion constant to the reference, or control, values exhibited by a cylindrically shaped protein (of equivalent radius), which can be related to the theory of Saffman and Delbrück [3]. At high tensions the corrections due to the shape of KvAP were very small ($\sim 5\%$), whilst at lower tensions the corrections ($\sim 40\%$) were much more pronounced.

In order to explain these results, the authors of [1] invoked a polaron-like theory [4–6]. This involves adding an extra term to the Hamiltonian of the membrane, which is coupled locally to membrane curvature and gives rise to a dimple consistent with the protein's shape. An Oseen approximation is then used to calculate an additional drag, which arises because a moving dimple must displace the surrounding viscous fluid. The corresponding reduction to the diffusion constant is then found by using the Stokes-Einstein relation. However, the approach neglects (*i*) the fact that membranes are themselves incompressible fluids, satisfying a two-dimensional form of Stokes equation, and (*ii*) that the movement of the protein imposes particular boundary conditions on the membrane flow (and the membrane flow, in turn, imposes conditions on the surrounding fluid flow). Moreover, the additional drag calculated in [1] was found to be too small to explain the experimental data, leading the authors to explore additional dissipative mechanisms. These were traced to membrane shear flows, or to the assumption that a protein might drag a large island of immobilised lipids through the membrane. However, the effects of these modifications were calculated within the same Oseen approximation, and cannot be expected to reliably describe any properties related to membrane flows for the reasons given: such flows must satisfy the equations of two-dimensional incompressible Stokes flow, and are subject to appropriate physical boundary conditions near the moving object. It is for these reasons that the results of Saffman and Delbrück do not emerge in the appropriate limit of zero curvature in [1].

Here, we instead seek a classical hydrodynamic explanation for the additional drag, and hence reduced diffusion, of curvature-inducing proteins. In order to take account of the geometry of the membrane, we employ a covariant formulation of low Reynolds number hydrodynamics in two dimensions [7–10]. In doing so, we neglect both membrane fluctuations and any chemical interactions occurring between the protein and the amphiphilic molecules that make up the membrane [11, 12]. By treating the membrane hydrodynamics in this way we find no additional dissipative mechanisms are required.

If the shape of the protein is fixed, our calculations predict an *increased* hydrodynamic drag at high tensions. The reason is that the induced dimple in the membrane becomes localised and sharp, increasing the Gaussian curvature of the membrane in the vicinity of the protein and introducing additional hydrodynamic shear stresses (see, for example, Ref. [9]). Such an effect is not apparent in the data, which suggests that, for sufficiently high tensions, the Brownian motion of KvAP should be indistinguishable from a cylindrically shaped protein of the same radius (such as the aquaporin AQP0, used as a



FIG. 1: **Flow diagram.** The shape of KvAP induces a local deformation in the membrane, resulting in non-zero Gaussian curvature in the vicinity of the protein. As tension is applied to the membrane, the deformation becomes more localised, increasing Gaussian curvature. A covariant formulation of low Reynolds number hydrodynamics demonstrates that Gaussian curvature increases the drag on the protein, therefore reducing diffusion. As a result, measurements of particle trajectories, such as those of Ref. [1], can be used alongside a simple elastic model of protein deformation to infer how protein shape is changed by applied tension.

control by Quemeneur *et al.*). This is evidence that the conformation, or shape, of the protein is changed by the torque exerted on the 'walls' where it meets the membrane [22]. Combining our hydrodynamic theory with linear elastic response yields an excellent fit to the data [1] and predicts the relevant torsional stiffness of KvAP. A flowchart representing our approach is shown in Fig. 1.

To develop a theory for the hydrodynamics associated with the motion of KvAP, the induced shape of the membrane must first be calculated. Taking the mid-plane of the bilayer to be a smooth Reimannian manifold $\mathcal{S}$, each point on $\mathcal{S}$ is attributed a Helfrich-like free energy per unit area [13, 14]. The lipids are assumed to remain well ordered everywhere and therefore the bilayer has a bending energy of $2\kappa H^2$, where κ is a constant and H is the mean curvature. The spontaneous curvature is zero, and the membrane is under lateral tension σ. In the experiments of [1], this is controlled by the pressure difference between the interior and exterior of a giant unilamellar vesicle. Neglecting fluctuations, the shape of the membrane at equilibrium is then found by minimising the total free energy

$$E = \int_{\mathcal{S}} \left(2\kappa\, H^2 + \sigma\right) dA, \tag{1}$$

where dA is used as a shorthand for the volume 2-form, vol^2, associated with $\mathcal{S}$. Using a small angle approximation, the solution can be characterised by an axisymmetric height field $\alpha\, h(r)$, $\forall\ r \in [a, \infty)$, where a is the radius of the protein and α is the contact angle subtended at the walls of the protein (see Fig. 2). Up to a constant factor, the variational procedure yields an order-0 modified Bessel function of the second kind (see [15] and SI):

$$h(r) = l\, K_0\left(r/l\right) \,/\, K_1\left(a/l\right), \tag{2}$$

where $l = \sqrt{\kappa/\sigma}$ is the membrane correlation length. Notice that increasing the surface tension leads to an increasingly localised membrane deformation, or dimple (see Fig. 1 of the SI).

The effect of the induced-shape (2) on protein diffusion may be calculated by first computing the hydrodynamic drag, λ, on a protein moving with constant velocity, and then relating this to the diffusion constant via the fluctuation-dissipation theorem [16]. We consider the protein moving laterally (*i.e.*, perpendicular to the z-axis of Fig. 2) with a velocity whose magnitude V is sufficiently small that $h(r)$ remains good approximation to the membrane shape [23] and the hydrodynamics remains at low Reynolds number [24]. The force balance condition for this motion is then $F = -\lambda V$, where F is the hydrodynamic stress integrated over the walls of the protein [16] and the sign signifies that drag forces act opposite to the direction of motion.

This otherwise straightforward calculation is greatly complicated by the shape of the membrane, and requires the use of differential geometry. For the uninitiated, a summary of both notation and relevant results is given in the SI. In brief, at each point on the manifold, the components Π^{ij} $(i, j = 1, 2)$ of the rank-(2,0) Cauchy stress tensor are defined with respect to a non-normalised basis $\boldsymbol{e}_i$, which spans the tangent plane to $\mathcal{S}$ at that point.



FIG. 2: **Sketch.** The embedded membrane protein KvAP induces a local curvature in an otherwise planar membrane. The mid-plane of the membrane is characterised by a cylindrically symmetric height $h(r)$, $\forall\ r \in [a, \infty)$ and is further proportional the contact angle α, which also serves as the small parameter in our perturbation theory for the hydrodynamic drag acting on KvAP.

In order to calculate such stresses, both the hydrostatic pressure p and components of the fluid velocity field v^i, are required, *i.e.*,

$$\Pi^{ij} = -pg^{ij} + \eta\left(v^{i;j} + v^{j;i}\right), \tag{3}$$

where the constant η is a two-dimensional viscosity and g^{ij} are the components of the inverse metric. Here, a comma "," and semi-colon ";" placed before a lower index represent partial and covariant differentiation, respectively, whilst upper-indices may be lowered and lower-indices raised by contraction with the metric and its inverse, respectively (*i.e.*, $v^i = v_j\, g^{ij}$ and $v^{i;j} = v^i{}_{;k}\, g^{kj}$, *etc.*). If the direction of motion of the inclusion is assumed (without loss of generality) to be in the x-direction, the net force F becomes

$$F = \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}} \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_i\right) \Pi^{ij}\, dl_j = -\lambda V, \tag{4}$$

where $\partial\mathcal{S}$ is the boundary between the surface and the protein, and dl_j is shorthand for the appropriate line 1-form(s). Under steady state conditions, the hydrostatic pressure and fluid velocity fields satisfy the *covariant* form of Stokes' equation [8–10]:

$$\eta\left(v^i{}_{;j}{}^{;j} + Kv^i\right) - p^{,i} = 0. \tag{5}$$

Here, the crucial difference with standard (Euclidean) hydrodynamics is that, if the membrane has a non-zero Gaussian curvature K, the shear stresses exerted by the fluid are modified.

In principle, the two equations (5) can be solved, subject to boundary conditions, when combined with the constraint of incompressibility, $v^i{}_{;i} = 0$. In practice, it is often easier to solve for a scalar stream function ψ by writing

$$v^i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}} \varepsilon^{ij} \psi_{,j}, \tag{6}$$

where ε^{ij} is a two-dimensional anti-symmetric Levi-Civita symbol, and $|g|$ is the determinant of the metric g_{ij}. Consigning the cumbersome derivation to the SI, we present the result in index-free notation using angle brackets $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ to indicate an inner product taken with respect to the metric

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta + K\right)\Delta\psi + \langle\nabla K, \nabla\psi\rangle = 0. \tag{7}$$

Here, ∇ is the gradient operator, extended to apply on a smooth manifold, and Δ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator. Equation (7) is a fourth order partial differential equation which encapsulates incompressible Stokes flow on a two-dimensional smooth manifold (surface) in one single equation. Notice that if the manifold is planar, *i.e.*, the Gaussian curvature is zero, then the usual biharmonic equation, $\Delta^2\psi = 0$, is recovered.



FIG. 3: **Tension-dependent diffusion.** Log-linear plot of membrane tension against diffusion constant for KvAP. Blue points represent experimental data from [1]. The red dot-dashed line is the tension independent diffusion constant of a cylindrical inclusion of equivalent radius [17]. This emerges at zeroth order in our perturbative scheme for KvAP. The next lowest non-zero corrections must be calculated numerically and are of order α^2. For proteins with a completely rigid conformation (constant contact angle $\alpha = 0.16$ Rad, irrespective of tension) the hydrodynamic picture is not compatible with the data (green dotted line). However, if the protein is permitted to deform elastically in response to the torque it experiences on its walls we obtain an excellent single-parameter fit (solid purple line). In all cases, the protein radius $a = 5$ nm, the membrane and solvent viscosities are $\eta = 6\times10^{-10}$ kg s^{-1} and $\mu = 10^{-3}$ kg m^{-1} s^{-1} respectively and the membrane rigidity is $\kappa = 20\, k_B T$ at room temperature.

Unfortunately, for most non-trivial geometries, finding a closed-form solution to (7) is problematic. However, approximate solutions may be constructed by considering the equation perturbatively. In our case, both the Laplace-Beltrami operator and the Gaussian curvature may be expanded as power series in terms of the small angle α. We further postulate (and later verify) that ψ can be expanded in the same way, *i.e.*, $\psi = \psi^{(0)} + \alpha\,\psi^{(1)} + \alpha^2\psi^{(2)} + O\left(\alpha^3\right)$. Equation (7) can now be solved order by order, subject to boundary conditions. We impose a no-slip condition at the interface between the protein and the membrane, whilst as $r \to \infty$, we follow [17] and match with the leading term, in r, of a different velocity field, found by solving a Stokes equation that incorporates the extra drag from the embedding fluid. At both boundaries, these conditions are satisfied at lowest order, leading to the following results.

At lowest order, $\psi^{(0)}$ satisfies the biharmonic equation and the results of Saffman [17] are reproduced by design. The resulting drag is $\lambda^{(0)} = 4\,\pi\,\eta/\mathcal{C}$, where $\mathcal{C} = \log(\eta/a\mu) - \gamma$, and γ is Euler's constant.

At first order, $\psi^{(1)}$ also satisfies the biharmonic equation. However, applying the boundary conditions gives $\psi^{(1)} = 0$, implying that $\lambda^{(1)} = 0$ [25]. This is a natural consequence of the up/down symmetry of the membrane: corrections to the drag coefficient λ must be invariant un-

der $\alpha \to -\alpha$.

At second order, $\psi^{(2)}$ satisfies an *inhomogeneous* biharmonic equation. The general solution can be constructed by combining the solution to the homogeneous equation with a particular solution that can be calculated via an appropriate Green's function, see SI for details. The resulting integrals must be calculated numerically [18] and there is therefore no closed-form solution for $\lambda^{(2)}$. Nevertheless, our result may still be compared with experiments [1] by invoking the Stokes-Einstein relation

$$D = D^{(0)} \left[1 - \alpha^2 \left(\lambda^{(2)}/\lambda^{(0)}\right)\right] + O\left(\alpha^3\right), \qquad (8)$$

where $D^{(0)} = k_B T/\lambda^{(0)} = k_B T\,\mathcal{C}/4\,\pi\,\eta$ is the diffusion coefficient of a cylindrical protein moving in a planar membrane [17]. Here $\lambda^{(2)}$ depends implicitly on σ through the shape of the membrane and hence the metric. Fig. 3 shows this result as a function of applied tension (green dotted curve). By kind permission of the authors, our results are shown against the original data from [1]. We see that rigid proteins, assumed to have a constant contact angle α, would experience a *reduction* in their diffusion constant at high tensions. The reason is that the dimple induced in the membrane becomes an increasingly localised region of high Gaussian curvature, resulting in extra shear stresses in the fluid and hence extra drag on the protein. This indicates that, regardless of the tension, a completely rigid conical protein (otherwise resembling KvAP) will never diffuse like a cylindrical one, such as AQP0.

We therefore propose that the shape of the protein changes with tension, and invoke linear torsional response $\tau = \tau_r + k\,(\alpha - \alpha_r)$. The torque τ exerted on the "walls" of the protein can be found from the boundary terms in the earlier variational analysis

$$\tau = 2\pi\, a\, \sigma\, h(a)\, \alpha. \qquad (9)$$

The subscript r denotes "reference", where τ_r is calculated by identifying the tension σ_r at which the green dotted line of Fig. 3 intersects the data, and then substituting both $\sigma = \sigma_r$ and $\alpha = \alpha_r = 0.16$ Rad (*i.e.*, the angle used in [1]) into Eq. (9). The result is a tension-dependent expression for the angle $\alpha(\sigma)$, which depends on the torsional stiffness k. Using a least-squares procedure, a single parameter fit for k gives excellent agreement with the data (solid purple line in Fig. 2) yielding a value of $k = 26.8\,k_B T$ at room temperature. Reassuringly, this is entirely consistent with the energies required for voltage activation [19]. Moreover, we predict non-negligible angular strains $\Delta\alpha := \alpha_0 - \alpha(\sigma)$, where $\alpha_0 := \lim_{\sigma\to 0} \alpha(\sigma) = 0.44$ Rad, for the range of tensions investigated in [1], see Fig. 4.

In the context of our evidence for significant structural strains at physiological tensions, a reassessment of the function and structure of membrane proteins under tension may be required. Our results are especially pertinent since the highly specialised functions of membrane-embedded proteins are currently thought to require precise spatial positioning of at least the key functional residues [20, 21]. We therefore welcome further work in the area.



FIG. 4: **Protein shape changes.** Log-linear plot of angular strain against membrane tension. In the physiological range investigated by [1], *i.e.,* 10^{-5}—10^{-3} N/m, we predict an angular variation of around 0.22 Rad, roughly equivalent to a material strain of about 20%.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the authors of [1] for discussions prior to publication and for permission to use their data. We acknowledge discussions with G. Rowlands (Warwick), A. Rautu (Warwick) and P. Sens (Paris) as well as discussion and critical reading of the manuscript by D. R. Daniels (Swansea). We also acknowledge EPSRC grant EP/I005439/1 (a Leadership Fellowship to MST).

[1] F. Quemeneur, J. K. Sigurdsson, M. Renner, P. J. Atzberger, P. Bassereau and D. Lacoste, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **111**, 5083 (2014).
[2] S. Amion, A. Callan-Jones, A. Bethaud, M. Pinot, G. E. S. Toombes and P. Bassereau, Dev. Cell. **28**, 2 (2013).
[3] P. Saffman and M. Delbrück, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **72**, 3111 (1975).
[4] A. Naji, P. Atzberger, and F. Brown, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 138102 (2009).
[5] E. Reister-Gottfried, S. M. Leitenberger, and U. Seifert, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 031903 (2010).
[6] V. Démery and D. S. Dean, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080601 (2010).
[7] D. R. Daniels and M. S. Turner, Langmuir **23** (2007).
[8] M. L. Henle, R. McGorty, A. B. Schofield, A. D. Dinsmore and A. J. Levine, Euro. Phys. Lett. **84**, 48001 (2008).
[9] M. Arroyo and A. DeSimone, Phys. Rev. E **79**, 031915 (2009).
[10] M. L. Henle and A. J. Levine, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 011905 (2010).

[11] Y. Gohon and J.-L. Popot, Curr. Opin. Colloid In. **8**, p15-22, (2003).
[12] D. V. Tulumello and C. M. Deber, Biochim. Biophys. Acta, **1818**(5), p1351-1358, (2012).
[13] W. Helfrich, Z. Nat. **28**, 693 (1973).
[14] U. Seifert, Adv. Phys. **46**, 13 (1997).
[15] T. R. Weikl, M. M. Kozlov and W. Helfrich, Phys. Rev. E **57** 6 (1998).
[16] G. K. Batchelor (Cambridge University Press, 1967).
[17] P. G. Saffman, J. Fluid Mech. **73**, 593 (1976).
[18] Wolfram Research, Inc., Mathematica, Version 10.1, Champaign, IL (2015).
[19] K. J. Swartz, Nature **456**, 891-897 (2008).
[20] R. MacKinnon, Nobel Lecture, Biosci. Rep. 24(2):75-100 (2004).
[21] J. G. McCoy and C. M. Nimigean, Biochim. Biophys. Acta 1818(2):272-285 (2012).
[22] Notwithstanding membrane hydrodynamics, the polaron model of [1] also permits protein deformation.
[23] Lateral motion of the protein generates a spatially varying two-dimensional pressure (*i.e.*, tension) in the membrane, as well as a rotation-inducing torque on the protein. However, the corrections to $h(r)$, which result in an asymmetric shape, are proportional to V. Since the drag coefficient λ is the leading order coefficient in a power series expansion of F in terms of V, it must not contain any such corrections, and the stationary membrane profile suffices for its calculation. This not the case in [1], which concerns the displacement of the surrounding fluid, and hence an asymmetric profile is necessary for force balance.
[24] Two dimensional fluids, such as membranes, are known to experience an extra drag due to induced viscous shear in the surrounding fluid [3]. In this paper, although the in-membrane flow is modified by membrane deformation, any changes to surrounding flows can be neglected so long as the characteristic length scale associated with the membrane deformation $\sqrt{\kappa/\sigma}$, is much less than the Saffman-Delbrück length η/μ, where η and μ are the two- and three- dimensional viscosities of the membrane and surrounding fluid, respectively. Using values taken from [1] ($\eta = 6\times10^{-10}\,\mathrm{kg\,s^{-1}}$, $\mu = 10^{-3}\,\mathrm{kg\,m^{-1}\,s^{-1}}$, and $\kappa = 20\,k_BT$ at room temperature) we find that the role of the embedding fluid can be neglected for tensions $\sigma \gtrsim 2\times10^{-7}\,\mathrm{N\,m^{-1}}$, consistent with the full range of investigated in [1].
[25] There is a first order correction to the velocity $\boldsymbol{v} = v^i\,\boldsymbol{e}_i$, because of the α-dependence of the basis vector $\boldsymbol{e}_1$. However, this correction plays no role in the lateral net force F, which acts in-plane by definition, and therefore $\lambda^{(1)} = 0$.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

This section is intended to provide both theoretical background (for example, in differential geometry) and also certain calculation details (such as the second order coefficient $\psi^{(2)}$ of the perturbative expansion of the stream function) which, although interesting, are secondary to the message of the main manuscript.



FIG. 5: **The effect of changing tension.** Plot of Eq. (12), the height profile of the membrane, as a function of the (non-dimensional) radial coordinate r/a ($a = 5$ nm, $\alpha = 0.16$ Rad, $\kappa = 8.2\times10^{-20}$ J). For the range of tensions investigated in [1], the localisation of the "dimple" caused by KvAP varies significantly.

Membrane shape

Associating a smooth Reimannian manifold, or regular surface, $\mathcal{S}$, with the mid-plane of the bi-layer, the shape induced by KvAP can be calculated by using a variational approach. Following the main text, the total (Helmholtz) free energy of the membrane is

$$E := \int_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\frac{\kappa}{2}(2H)^2 + \sigma\right] dA, \tag{10}$$

where dA is used as a shorthand for the volume 2-form, vol^2, associated with the manifold $\mathcal{S}$ (see next Section). The shape of the membrane at equilibrium is found by minimising (10) over a family of surfaces. Here, since the parameterisation must be radially symmetric, a polar Monge approach will suffice. That is, each surface is characterised by a height field $\epsilon\,h(r)$, where $r \in [a,\infty)$. The distance h is measured in the direction normal to the plane and ϵ is a small number to help ensure that, formally, we are restricted to single-valued surfaces. Expanding in powers of ϵ and setting the variation equal to zero leads to a fourth order Euler-Lagrange equation in one-dimension:

$$\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}\left(r\frac{d}{dr}\right) - \frac{\sigma}{\kappa}\right]\left[\frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}\left(r\frac{d}{dr}\right)\right] h(r) = 0. \tag{11}$$

At large r, the boundary conditions are that the height function and its first derivative must vanish, *i.e.* $\lim_{r\to\infty} h(r) = 0$, and $\lim_{r\to\infty} d\,h/dr = 0$. At the inclusion, we have $\epsilon\,(d\,h/dr)|_{r=a} = -\tan\alpha \simeq -\alpha$, where α is the small angle subtended at the inclusion. The solution to (11) can be shown to be [15]

$$\epsilon\,h(r) = \alpha\,l\,K_0\,(r/l)\;/\,K_1\,(a/l)\,, \tag{12}$$

where a is the radius of the protein, $l = \sqrt{\kappa/\sigma}$ is the membrane correlation length and K_n is an order-n modified Bessel function of the second kind. Equation (12)

implies that $\epsilon = \alpha$, giving a convenient interpretation for our small parameter as the angle, at the interface of the membrane and the inclusion, between the outward normal of the inclusion and the plane defined by the z-axis (see Fig. 2 of the main text). Moreover, plotting (12) for increasing values of surface tension indicates that the disturbance caused by the protein becomes increasingly localised (see Fig. 1).

Differential geometry

Before considering Stokes' flow on a manifold, it is first necessary to understand the basic aspects and notation of differential geometry. Here, we aim to provide only what is necessary or helpful to understand the main article and the focus is therefore two-dimensional Riemannian manifolds.

The components of a vector $\boldsymbol{v}$ and its corresponding 1-form v are distinguished by superscript and subscript, respectively. That is, if a two-dimensional smooth Riemannian manifold— the surface— is parameterised by coordinates $\{u^i : i = 1, 2\}$ then $\boldsymbol{v} = v^i \boldsymbol{e}_i$ and $v = v_i \mathrm{d}u^i$, where an implicit sum is understood by repeated indices of different type (*i.e.*, upper and lower). Under a change of coordinates, the transformation properties of the functions v^i and v_i can be readily calculated. The former is said to transform in a contravariant way, and the latter in a covariant way. Here, if $\boldsymbol{R}(u^1, u^2)$ gives the position of points on the surface relative to some origin, then

$$\boldsymbol{e}_i := \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{R}(u^1, u^2)}{\partial u^i}, \tag{13}$$

are basis vectors (not normalised) for the tangent space at each point on the surface. Furthermore, $\{\mathrm{d}u^i : i = 1, 2\}$ form the corresponding basis of 1-forms, such that $\mathrm{d}u^i(\boldsymbol{e}_j) = \delta^i_j$, where δ^i_j is the Kronecker delta symbol.

Since the manifold is Riemannian, it is equipped with a positive-definite metric, whose components $g_{ij} := \boldsymbol{e}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{e}_j$, induce an inner product, which we denote by angle brackets $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Specifically, for arbitrary vectors (of the same dimension) $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}$, we may define $\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w} \rangle := v^i g_{ij} w^j$. The inner product then permits the explicit identification of vectors, *e.g.*, $\boldsymbol{v}$, with its dual 1-form, v, by the condition $v(\boldsymbol{w}) = \langle \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w} \rangle$, which holds for all $\boldsymbol{w}$. Noticing that $v(\boldsymbol{w}) = v_i \mathrm{d}u^i(\boldsymbol{w}) = v_i w^i$ and using the above definition of the inner product of two vectors implies the raising and lowering properties of the metric and its inverse (g^{ij}), respectively. That is, $v_i = g_{ij} v^j$ and $v^i = g^{ij} v_j$. Using this property, the inner product acting on two 1-forms can be defined in a complementary way to that of the inner product on vectors:

$$\langle v, w \rangle := v_i g^{ij} w_j = v_i w^i = \langle \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w} \rangle. \tag{14}$$

The identification of vectors with 1-forms may also be used to describe the action of the exterior derivative operator d on a scalar field (0-form) ϕ. That is, $\mathrm{d}\phi(\boldsymbol{v}) = \langle \nabla\phi, \boldsymbol{v} \rangle$ for all vectors $\boldsymbol{v}$, where

$$\nabla\phi := g^{ij} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial u^i} \boldsymbol{e}_j, \tag{15}$$

is just the usual gradient operator, extended to apply on a smooth manifold. In general, the exterior derivative takes a k-form to $(k+1)$-form, though its full definition is not required here. Nevertheless, it is helpful to list some properties of d. First, repeated application always yields zero. That is, $\mathrm{d}\mathrm{d}v = \mathrm{d}^2 v = 0$ for an arbitrary differential form w. Second, the action of d is distributive over the wedge product. For example, $\mathrm{d}(v \wedge w) = \mathrm{d}v \wedge w - v \wedge \mathrm{d}w$, where v and w are 1-forms. Here, the wedge product is just an anti-symmetrised tensor product $v \wedge w = v \otimes w - w \otimes v = -w \wedge v$, which is very natural in geometrical systems. In particular, the volume 2-form for a two-dimensional surface is written as the following wedge product

$$\mathrm{vol}^2 = \sqrt{|g|}\, \mathrm{d}u^1 \wedge \mathrm{d}u^2, \tag{16}$$

where $|g| := \det g_{ij}$. The volume form in two-dimensions is an area, and often written using the shorthand "dA". It can be used to define a pair of line 1-forms "dl_i", which are natural in the given coordinate system:

$$dl_i := \mathrm{vol}^2(\boldsymbol{e}_i) = \sqrt{|g|} \sum_{j>i} \varepsilon_{ij}\, \mathrm{d}u^j, \tag{17}$$

where ε_{ij} is a two-dimensional Levi-Civita tensor density of weight -1. Notice that the sum only permits values of $i > j$, therefore $dl_1 = \sqrt{|g|}\mathrm{d}u^2$ and $dl_2 = 0$.

The covariant derivative (or Levi-Civita connection) at a point x is an extension of the directional derivative. It takes two arguments: a direction vector $\boldsymbol{T}$ defined in the tangent plane at x and a tensor field over the tangent bundle to the manifold, that must be smoothly varying in the neighbourhood of x. Assuming a two-dimensional smooth (Riemannian) manifold, with coordinates u^i, the action on a scalar field ϕ is then $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{T}}\phi := \phi_{,j}\, \mathrm{d}u^j(\boldsymbol{T})$, where a subscript comma "," is shorthand for a partial derivative, *i.e.*,

$$\phi_{,j} := \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial u^j}. \tag{18}$$

When acting on a vector $\boldsymbol{v} = v^i \boldsymbol{e}_i$, we write $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{T}}\boldsymbol{v} := \boldsymbol{e}_i \left(v^i{}_{;j}\right) \mathrm{d}u^j(\boldsymbol{T})$, where the components $v^i{}_{;j}$ are given by

$$v^i{}_{;j} := v^i{}_{,j} + v^k \Gamma^i_{jk}. \tag{19}$$

Once again, a subscript comma "," is shorthand for a partial derivative,

$$v^i{}_{,j} := \frac{\partial v^i}{\partial u^j}, \tag{20}$$

whilst the $\Gamma^i_{jk} = g^{ip}\left(g_{pj,k} + g_{pk,j} - g_{jk,p}\right)/2$ are Christoffel symbols, which define the action of the covariant derivative, via $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{e}_i}\boldsymbol{e}_j = \boldsymbol{e}_k\Gamma^k_{ij}$. Note that the shorthand $\nabla_i := \nabla_{\boldsymbol{e}_i}$ is frequently used in physics. For a 1-from, the action of the covariant derivative can be defined by demanding that the "Leibniz rule" holds. That is, if a scalar field is defined by the action of a 1-form on a vector, *i.e.*, $\phi := v(\boldsymbol{w}) = v^i\, w_i$, then

$$\nabla_i\left(v^j\, w_j\right) = \left(v^j\, w_j\right)_{,i} := v^j{}_{;i}\, w_j + v^j\, w_{j;i}. \tag{21}$$

The result is that

$$v_{i;j} := v_{i,j} - v_k\,\Gamma^k_{ij}, \tag{22}$$

which is consistent with the notion of using the metric as a raising / lowering operator (*i.e.*, $v_{i;j} = g_{ij}v^j{}_{;k}$).

Stokes' flow on a manifold

As described in the main text, the aim is to calculate the drag coefficient associated with an inclusion moving though a two-dimensional fluid. If the protein is moving with a steady velocity $\boldsymbol{V} = V\hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}$ then the force balance equation for hydrodynamic drag is given by

$$F = \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_i\right)\Pi^{ij}\, dl_j = -\lambda V, \tag{23}$$

where $\partial\mathcal{S}$ is the boundary to the surface at the inclusion and dl_j is shorthand for the line 1-form. The Cauchy stress tensor is a rank-$(2,0)$ tensor, with components given by

$$\Pi^{ij} := -pg^{ij} + \eta\left(v^{i;j} + v^{j;i}\right), \tag{24}$$

where p is the hydrostatic pressure field, the constant η is a two-dimensional viscosity. So, in order to calculate the drag, it is first necessary to know both the pressure and velocity fields, *i.e.*, to solve Stokes' equation. As mentioned in the main text, the derivation of Stokes' equation on a manifold already exists in the literature. The result, in component form, is that

$$\eta\left(v^i{}_{;j}{}^{;j} + Kv^i\right) - p^{,i} = 0. \tag{25}$$

In principle, (25) can be solved, for given boundary conditions, when taken together with the condition of incompressibility,

$$v^i{}_{;i} = 0. \tag{26}$$

In practice, it is often easier to use a stream function ψ, defined such that

$$v^i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\varepsilon^{ij}\psi_{,j}, \tag{27}$$

where ε^{ij} is a two-dimensional anti-symmetric Levi-Civita symbol, and $|g|$ is the determinant of the metric g_{ij}. We remark that, by taking the embedding space into account, Eq. (27) is equivalent to writing $\boldsymbol{v} = \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\times\nabla\psi$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is the unit normal to the surface and ∇ is the gradient operator of the manifold [*cf.* Eq. (15)]. Furthermore, by definition, taking the divergence of (27) by applying the covariant derivative and contracting over the two free indices, yields zero.

At this point, we wish to derive an equation that, given boundary conditions, can be used to calculate ψ. We start by noticing that, in fact, under coordinate transformation, ε^{ij} transforms as a tensor density of weight $+1$ (and ε_{ij} with a weight -1). This means that $\varepsilon^{ij}/\sqrt{|g|}$ behaves like a (pure) tensor, and hence gives Eq. (27) the correct transformation properties. It is clear that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\varepsilon^{ij} = \begin{cases} 1/\sqrt{|g|} & \text{for } (i,j) = (1,2) \\ -1/\sqrt{|g|} & \text{for } (i,j) = (2,1) \\ 0 & \text{for } i = j \end{cases}, \tag{28}$$

which is helpful when substituting (27) into (25). By using the distributive property of the covariant derivative— *i.e.*, $(\phi\, a^i)_{;j} = \phi_{,j}\, a^i + \phi\, a^i{}_{;j}$ for scalar field ϕ and vector components a^i— together with the fact that the covariant derivative of the determinant of the metric vanishes, we see that (25) becomes

$$\frac{\eta\,\varepsilon^{ij}}{\sqrt{|g|}}\left[\psi_{,j;k}{}^{;k} + K\,\psi_{,j}\right] - p^{,i} = 0. \tag{29}$$

The first term can be further simplified by the invoking the rules for commuting covariant derivatives. In order to see this, it is first helpful to make the contraction over the index "k" explicit, by writing it as the action of a Kronecker delta, *i.e.*, $\psi_{,j;k}{}^{;k} = \delta^k_l\,\psi_{,j;k}{}^{;l}$. From here, we note that $\psi_{,j;k} = \psi_{,k;j}$, which can be seen from the definition (22). Next, we may apply the commutation relation

$$\psi_{,k;j}{}^{;l} = \psi_{,k}{}^{;l}{}_{;j} - g^{lp}\,\mathcal{R}^q_{kpj}\,\psi_{,q}, \tag{30}$$

where $\mathcal{R}^q_{kpj}$ are the components of the Riemann tensor, which is given in two-dimensions by the Bianchi identity $\mathcal{R}^q_{kpj} = K\,g^{ql}\left(g_{lp}\,g_{kj} - g_{lj}\,g_{kp}\right)$. Re-applying the contraction implied by δ^k_l, the result is that

$$\frac{\eta\,\varepsilon^{ij}}{\sqrt{|g|}}\left[\left(\Delta\psi\right)_{,j} + 2K\,\psi_{,j}\right] - p^{,i} = 0. \tag{31}$$

Here, Δ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator

$$\Delta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g|}}\frac{\partial}{\partial u^i}\left(\sqrt{|g|}g^{ij}\frac{\partial}{\partial u^j}\right), \tag{32}$$

defined such that $\Delta\psi = \psi_{,i}{}^{;i}$. Finally, the pressure term in this equation may be eliminated by taking the two-dimensional analog of the curl ($\operatorname{curl}\boldsymbol{a} = \varepsilon_{ij}a^{j;i}$). Using

angle brackets $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ according to (14) the resulting equation can be written in index-free notation as

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\Delta + K\right)\Delta\psi + \langle\nabla K, \nabla\psi\rangle = 0. \tag{33}$$

As remarked in the main text, for most non-trivial geometries, finding a closed-form solution to (33) is problematic. Therefore, in this paper, we find approximate solutions by considering the equation perturbatively.

Perturbation theory

In order to treat (33) perturbatively, both the Laplace-Beltrami operator and the Gaussian curvature must be expanded as power series in terms of α, then, postulating that ψ can be expanded in the same way,

$$\psi = \psi^{(0)} + \alpha\psi^{(1)} + \alpha^2\psi^{(2)} + O\left(\alpha^3\right), \tag{34}$$

Eq. (33) may be solved order by order. As in the main text, bracketed superscripts indicate the order, in α, of each term. That is, $\psi^{(0)}$ is of order constant (*i.e.*, $\alpha^0 = 1$) and $\psi^{(1)}$ is order α, and so on and so forth. In order to understand these corrections, recall that the control parameter α has a clear interpretation as an angle, and therefore the perturbation theory is best though of geometrically.

As indicated in Fig. 2 of the main text, polar coordinates r and θ are used, with the origin on the axis of symmetry of the inclusion. Each point on the surface then has position relative to the origin of $\boldsymbol{R}(r,\theta) = r\hat{\boldsymbol{r}} - \alpha h(r)\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}$ are just the usual vectors in cylindrical polars, and $h(r)$ is given by (12). The definition (13) implies that the tangent vectors at each point on the surface are then just

$$\boldsymbol{e}_1 := \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{R}}{\partial r} = \hat{\boldsymbol{r}} - \alpha h'\hat{\boldsymbol{z}}, \text{ and } \boldsymbol{e}_2 := \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{R}}{\partial\theta} = r\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tag{35}$$

where a dash is used as shorthand for derivative, *i.e.*, $h' := dh/dr$. (Recall that the vectors $\{\boldsymbol{e}_i : i = 1, 2\}$ are not normalised). Using these definitions, the components of the metric

$$g_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \alpha^2\left(h'\right)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & r^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{36}$$

and its inverse

$$g^{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \left[1 + \alpha^2\left(h'\right)^2\right]^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1/r^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{37}$$

can be calculated, from which it is immediately clear that $|g| = r^2\left[1 + \alpha^2\left(h'\right)^2\right]$. Furthermore, the Christoffel symbols may be computed as

$$\Gamma^1_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2 h'\, h''\left[1 + \alpha^2\left(h'\right)^2\right]^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & r\left[1 + \alpha^2\left(h'\right)^2\right]^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{38}$$

and

$$\Gamma^2_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1/r \\ 1/r & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{39}$$

Note that the Γ^k_{ij} are not required for calculating either ψ or the component functions v^i [via Eq. (27)]. However, they are necessary when computing covariant derivatives of v^i, which appear in the definition of the stress tensor Π^{ij} [*cf.* Eq. (24)].

Using the above results and the definition (32), we see that the Laplace-Beltrami operator may be expanded in the following way

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta &= \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(r\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right) + \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta^2} - \alpha^2\frac{h'}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(rh'\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\right) + O\left(\alpha^3\right) \\ &= \Delta^{(0)} + \alpha^2\Delta^{(2)} + O\left(\alpha^3\right).\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Here, notice that the second order correction is an operator that acts on the radial variable only, as expected on symmetry grounds. In order to calculate the Gaussian curvature, we invoke the Brioschi formula which, since the metric is diagonal, simplifies greatly, leading to

$$\begin{aligned}K &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{|g|}}\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\frac{g_{11}}{\sqrt{|g|}}\right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\left(\frac{g_{22}}{\sqrt{|g|}}\right)\right] \\ &= \alpha^2\frac{h'h''}{r} + O\left(\alpha^3\right) \\ &= \alpha^2 K^{(2)} + O\left(\alpha^3\right).\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

In summary, the lowest order corrections to both the Laplace-Beltrami operator and the Gaussian curvature occur at second order [and the $O(1)$ contribution to the Gaussian curvature is zero]. Along with a set of given boundary conditions, the above formulas are all that is necessary to solve for the stream function ψ order by order.

Boundary conditions

The inclusion is moving with a constant velocity V, therefore imposing a no-slip condition at the interface between the inclusion and the membrane, gives

$$v^1(a,\theta) = V\cos\theta, \text{ and } v^2(a,\theta) = -\frac{V}{a}\sin\theta, \tag{42}$$

where the in-plane angle θ is measured from the positive x-direction. The conditions (42) are true to all orders of α, however, in our case, they are fully satisfied at lowest order, *i.e.*,

$$\left[v^1\right]^{(0)}(a,\theta) = V\cos\theta, \text{ and } \left[v^2\right]^{(0)}(a,\theta) = -\frac{V}{a}\sin\theta, \tag{43}$$

where bracketed superscripts are once again used to indicate coefficients in a series expansion in terms of α:

$$v^i = \left[v^i\right]^{(0)} + \alpha \left[v^i\right]^{(1)} + \alpha^2 \left[v^i\right]^{(2)} + O\left(\alpha^3\right). \quad (44)$$

The result of the above is that all but the lowest order coefficients of this expansion must therefore vanish at the boundary. That is

$$\left[v^i\right]^{(n)}(a,\theta) = 0 \ \forall \ n \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (45)$$

As mentioned earlier, rather than use these conditions to calculate the functions v^i directly, it is easier to first solve (33) for the stream function and then use Eq. (27). To this end, we must translate the boundary conditions on the component functions of the velocity field into those for the function ψ. In general [see Eq. (27)] we have the following order-by-order relationships

$$\left[v^i\right]^{(0)} = \frac{\varepsilon^{ij}}{r}\psi^{(0)}_{,j}, \ \left[v^i\right]^{(1)} = \frac{\varepsilon^{ij}}{r}\psi^{(1)}_{,j}, \quad (46)$$

and

$$\left[v^i\right]^{(2)} = \frac{\varepsilon^{ij}}{r}\left[\psi^{(2)}_{,j} - \frac{\left(h'\right)^2}{2}\psi^{(0)}_{,j}\right]. \quad (47)$$

At the boundary, using the definition of $h(r)$ and applying both (43) and (45) gives

$$\psi^{(0)}(a,\theta) = Va\sin\theta, \ \psi^{(1)}(a,\theta) = 0, \quad (48)$$

and

$$\psi^{(2)}(a,\theta) = (Va/2)\sin\theta. \quad (49)$$

By contrast, as r approaches infinity, we follow Saffman [17] and impose that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\psi^{(0)}(r,\theta) = \frac{Ur\sin\theta}{\mathcal{C}}\left(\mathcal{C} + \frac{1}{2} - \log\frac{r}{a}\right), \quad (50)$$

where $\mathcal{C} := \log(\eta/a\mu) - \gamma$ is a constant. Here, γ is Euler's constant, and μ is the (three-dimensional) viscosity of the embedding fluid. The condition (50) comes from a matching criterion that arises when solving a Stokes'-like equation that has been modified due to the drag that results from a no-slip condition with the embedding fluid [17]. Once again, at all higher orders, we simply have

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\psi^{(n)}(r,\theta) = 0, \ \forall \ n \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (51)$$

Separation of angular dependence

An immediate consequence of the above boundary conditions is that the θ-dependence of ψ is trivial. That is, by writing

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(r,\theta) &= \phi(r)\sin\theta \\ &= \left[\phi^{(0)}(r) + \alpha\phi^{(1)}(r) + \alpha^2\phi^{(2)}(r) + O(\alpha^3)\right]\sin\theta,\end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Eq. (33) can be reduced to a fourth order *ordinary* differential equation (as opposed to a partial differential equation). Up to $O(\alpha^2)$, this can be seen by noting that only the $O(1)$ part of the Laplace-Beltrami operator, $\Delta^{(0)}$, acts on the variable θ. Higher order corrections, such as $\Delta^{(2)}$ and $K^{(2)}$, are concerned with the radial variable only. Moreover, given the θ-dependence of ψ, the second partial derivative $\partial^2/\partial\theta^2$ contained in the definition of $\Delta^{(0)}$ leads to the following relation: $\Delta^{(0)}\psi(r,\theta) = \hat{B}\left[\phi(r)\right]\sin\theta$. Here, $\hat{B}$ is then a second-order ordinary differential operator

$$\hat{B} := \frac{1}{r}\frac{d}{dr}\left(r\frac{d}{dr}\right) - \frac{1}{r}, \quad (53)$$

whose eigenfunctions are modified Bessel functions of order one.

Calculating the stream function

With the variable dependencies separated according to (52) we may proceed to solve (33) for ϕ (and hence ψ) order by order.

Zeroth order

At lowest order, $\psi^{(0)}$ satisfies the biharmonic equation, which, in terms of the radial function $\phi^{(0)}$ translates to

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{B}^2\phi^{(0)}(r) = 0, \\ \implies &\phi^{(0)}(r) = \frac{\mathcal{C}_1}{r} + \mathcal{C}_2 r + \mathcal{C}_3 r^3 + \mathcal{C}_4 r\log\left(\frac{r}{a}\right).\end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Applying the boundary conditions, we recover Saffman's result

$$\psi^{(0)}(r,\theta) = -\frac{Ur\sin\theta}{\mathcal{C}}\left[\mathcal{C} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{a^2}{2r^2} - \log\frac{r}{a}\right], \quad (55)$$

by design.

First order

At first order, $\psi^{(1)}$ also satisfies the biharmonic equation, and therefore $\phi^{(1)} \sim \mathcal{C}_1/r + \mathcal{C}_2 r + \mathcal{C}_3 r^3 + \mathcal{C}_4 r\log(r/a)$, as above. However, applying the boundary conditions gives $\phi^{(1)} = 0$ and therefore $\psi^{(1)} = 0$.

Second order

At second order, $\psi^{(2)}$ satisfies an *inhomogeneous* biharmonic equation, which, in terms of the radial dependence, gives

$$\hat{B}^2\phi^{(2)} = \Phi, \quad (56)$$

where

$$\Phi := -\left\{\hat{B}, \Delta^{(2)}\right\}\phi^{(0)} - 2K^{(2)}\hat{B}\phi^{(0)} - 2\left\langle \nabla K^{(2)}, \nabla\phi^{(0)}\right\rangle. \tag{57}$$

Here, comma separated curly brackets $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ are used to represent the anti-commutator, *i.e.*, $\{\hat{a},\hat{b}\} := \hat{a}\hat{b} + \hat{b}\hat{a}$, for two operators $\hat{a}$ and $\hat{b}$. The solution to (57) is a sum of homogeneous and particular parts, $\phi_h^{(2)}$ and $\phi_p^{(2)}$, respectively. Here, $\phi_h^{(2)}$ is just the solution of the homogeneous equation, whilst $\phi_p^{(2)}$ can be found by constructing a Green's function $G(r,\xi)$ in order to satisfy the following equation:

$$\hat{B}^2\left[G\left(r,\xi\right)\right] = \delta\left(r-\xi\right). \tag{58}$$

The right-hand side is just a Dirac delta function, and the operator $\hat{B}$ is given by the definition (53). For all values of r other than $r=\xi$— *i.e.*, intervals $a \le r < \xi$ and $\xi < r \le \infty$— the function $G(r,\xi)$ satisfies the homogeneous equation $\hat{B}^2\left[G\left(r,\xi\right)\right] = 0$. Therefore, applying the boundary conditions $G(a,\xi) = \text{const}$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} G(r,\xi) = 0$ implies that

$$G(r,\xi) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_2 r + \mathcal{D}_3 r^3 + \mathcal{D}_4 r\log\left(r/a\right), & a \le r < \xi, \\ \mathcal{D}_1/r, & \xi < r \le \infty. \end{cases} \tag{59}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_1$, $\mathcal{D}_2$, $\mathcal{D}_3$ and $\mathcal{D}_4$ are functions of ξ determined by continuity conditions imposed on G and its derivatives. Since $\hat{B}^2$ is a fourth order operator, we impose that third order derivatives $d^3G(r,\xi)/dr^3$ are discontinuous at $r=\xi$. Furthermore, $G(r,\xi)$ is assumed continuous in the variable r, and so too are its first and second derivatives $dG(r,\xi)/dr$ and $d^2G(r,\xi)/dr^2$. In order to quantify the discontinuity in the third order derivative of G, we multiply (58) by r and integrate over the interval $[\xi-\varepsilon, \xi+\varepsilon]$, giving

$$\int_{\xi-\varepsilon}^{\xi+\varepsilon} r\hat{B}^2\left[G\left(r,\xi\right)\right] dr = \xi. \tag{60}$$

The integrand splits into two parts, one of which is an exact differential and therefore can be integrated easily, implying

$$\xi = \left[r\frac{d^3G(r,\xi)}{dr^3} + \frac{d^2G(r,\xi)}{dr^2} - \frac{2}{r}\frac{dG(r,\xi)}{dr} + \frac{2}{r^2}G(r,\xi)\right]_{r=\xi-\varepsilon}^{r=\xi+\varepsilon} - \int_{\xi-\varepsilon}^{\xi+\varepsilon}\frac{1}{r}\hat{B}\left[G\left(r,\xi\right)\right] dr. \tag{61}$$

Taking the limit $\varepsilon \to 0$ of (61) then gives

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\left[\frac{d^3G(r,\xi)}{dr^3}\right]_{r=\xi-\varepsilon}^{r=\xi+\varepsilon} = 1, \tag{62}$$

as required. Using (62) and the fact that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\left[\frac{d^nG(r,\xi)}{dr^n}\right]_{r=\xi-\varepsilon}^{r=\xi+\varepsilon} = 0,\ \forall\ n = 0,1,2, \tag{63}$$

Eq. (59) can be solved for the functions $\mathcal{D}_1$, $\mathcal{D}_2$, $\mathcal{D}_3$ and $\mathcal{D}_4$. The result is that

$$\mathcal{D}_1 = \frac{\xi^4}{16},\ \mathcal{D}_2 = \frac{\xi^2}{4}\log\left(\xi/a\right),\ \mathcal{D}_3 = \frac{1}{16},\ \text{and}\ \mathcal{D}_4 = -\frac{\xi^2}{4}, \tag{64}$$

which, when substituted into (59), gives the final form of our Green's function. Convolving $G(r,\xi)$ with Φ then gives the result

$$\phi_p^{(2)} = \frac{1}{16r}\int_a^r \xi^4\Phi(\xi)\,d\xi + \frac{r}{4}\int_r^\infty \xi^2\Phi(\xi)\log(\xi/a)\,d\xi + \frac{r^3}{16}\int_r^\infty \Phi(\xi)\,d\xi - \frac{r}{4}\log\left(r/a\right)\int_r^\infty \xi^2\Phi(\xi)\,d\xi, \tag{65}$$

Finally, we remark that the function Φ is known, and can be written in terms of the functions $\phi^{(0)}$, h, and their derivatives. Of course, h is know (see main article) and $\phi^{(0)}$ is given by (55), however, the resulting form, in terms of Bessel functions of the second kind, is both cumbersome and not very illuminating. It is included only for completeness.

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi = \frac{V}{16\,\mathcal{C}\,r^4\left[K_1\left(a/l\right)\right]^2}\Bigg\{ & -3\,\sigma\,r^2\,\left[K_0\left(r/l\right)\right]^2\left[11\,a^2 + (5+6\,\mathcal{C})\,r^2 - 6\,r^2\,\log\left(r/a\right)\right] \\ & + \sigma\,r^2\left[K_2\left(r/l\right)\right]^2\left[-7\,a^2 + (2\,\mathcal{C}-9)\,r^2 - 2\,r^2\,\log\left(r/a\right)\right] \\ & - \frac{4\,r}{l}K_0\left(r/l\right)\,K_1\left(r/l\right)\left[3\,(5+6\,\mathcal{C})\,\kappa\,r^2 + 4\,(2\,\mathcal{C}-1)\,\sigma\,r^4 + \left(41\,\kappa + 4\,\sigma\,r^2\right)a^2 - \left(9\,\kappa + 4\,\sigma\,r^2\right)2r^2\,\log\left(r/a\right)\right] \\ & - 4\left[K_1\left(r/l\right)\right]^2\left[3\,(5+6\,\mathcal{C})\,r^2\,\kappa + 4\,(1+2\,\mathcal{C})\,\sigma\,r^4 + \left(49\,\kappa + 12\,\sigma\,r^2\right)a^2 - \left(9\,\kappa + 4\,\sigma\,r^2\right)2\,r^2\,\log\left(r/a\right)\right]\Bigg\}.\end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Turning attention to the homogeneous part, a straightforward application of the boundary conditions gives $\phi_h^{(2)} = \mathcal{A}/r + \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are the following constants:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A} =& \frac{a^2}{2} + \frac{3a^4}{16}\int_a^\infty \Phi(\xi)\,d\xi + \frac{a^2}{4}\int_a^\infty \xi^2\Phi(\xi)\log(\xi/a)\,d\xi \\ &- \frac{a^2}{4}\int_a^\infty \xi^2\Phi(\xi)\,d\xi,\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B} =& -\frac{a^3}{4}\int_a^\infty \Phi(\xi)\,d\xi - \frac{a}{2}\int_a^\infty \xi^2\Phi(\xi)\log(\xi/a)\,d\xi \\ &+ \frac{a}{4}\int_a^\infty \xi^2\Phi(\xi)\,d\xi.\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Notice that, as required, $\lim_{r\to\infty}\phi^{(2)}(r) = 0$ and $\phi^{(2)}(a) = Va/2$ [*cf.* Eqs. (48) and (49)]. Due to the complexity of Φ, the integrals involved in the above expressions [(65), (67) and (68)] cannot be solved analytically. Therefore, at second order, we are restricted to numerical solutions. (Albeit ones that are relatively straightforward to compute).

Lateral mobility

Since, in general, we are restricted to perturbative solutions for ψ, the equation for the drag coefficient must also be considered order by order:

$$F^{(0)}+\alpha F^{(1)}+\alpha^2 F^{(2)} = -\left[\lambda^{(0)} + \alpha\lambda^{(1)} + \alpha^2\lambda^{(2)}\right]V + O\left(\alpha^3\right). \tag{69}$$

Here, the left hand side corresponds to Eq. (23) which, by substituting for the definition of the stress tensor Π^{ij}, can be written as

$$F = \int_{\partial\mathcal{S}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_i\right)\left[-pg^{ij} + \eta\left(v^{i;j} + v^{j;i}\right)\right]\,dl_j. \tag{70}$$

In principle, we now have everything necessary to expand this expression in terms of α and compute the coefficients. That is, from the definition of the tangent basis $\boldsymbol{e}_i$ [see Eq. (35)], it is clear that

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_1 = \cos\theta \text{ and } \hat{\boldsymbol{\imath}}\cdot\boldsymbol{e}_2 = -r\,\sin\theta. \tag{71}$$

Furthermore, from (17), the line 1-form(s) dl_i are given by

$$dl_1 = \left[1 + \alpha^2\frac{(h')^2}{2} + O\left(\alpha^3\right)\right] r\,\mathrm{d}\theta, \text{ and } dl_2 = 0. \tag{72}$$

All that remains, therefore, is to calculate the components of the stress tensor from the results in the previous section. The coefficients, in a series expansion in terms of α, of the component functions v^i are given by Eqs. (46) and (47). Calculating the covariant derivative [see Eq. (19)] of these functions then requires the Christoffel symbols (38) and (39). Similarly, the coefficients in the α-expansion of the pressure

$$p = p^{(0)} + \alpha\,p^{(1)} + \alpha^2\,p^{(2)} + O\left(\alpha^3\right). \tag{73}$$

may be calculated by combining (31) with the series expansions (34) to (41).

Zeroth order

In a straightforward application of Eqs. (46) and (47), the lowest order coefficients of the velocity functions can be easily calculated. As can the lowest order coefficient of the series expansion of the pressure. In both cases, we simply reproduce the results of Saffman [17] and the resulting drag is therefore

$$\lambda^{(0)} = \frac{4\pi\eta}{\mathcal{C}}. \tag{74}$$

First order

By virtue of the fact that $\psi^{(1)} = 0$, the definitions (46) and (47) imply that, at first order, the coefficients (in the α-expansion) of both the velocity components and the pressure are zero *i.e.*,

$$\left[v^i\right]^{(1)} = 0,\ \forall\ i = 1, 2, \text{ and } p^{(1)} = 0. \tag{75}$$

Notice that this does not mean that there is no first order correction to the velocity $\boldsymbol{v} = v^i\,\boldsymbol{e}_i$, because of the α-dependence of the basis vector $\boldsymbol{e}_1$ [*cf.* Eqs. (35)]. However, this correction plays no role in the net force F, which acts opposite to the direction of movement (i.e., in-plane). That is

$$F^{(1)} = 0,\implies \lambda^{(1)} = 0. \tag{76}$$

This should not be a surprise as the membrane is up/down symmetric and therefore any corrections to the drag coefficient λ should be invariant under the sign change $\alpha \to -\alpha$.

Second order

As explained above, in principle, the solution to $\phi^{(2)}$, combined with the trivial angular dependence of $\psi^{(2)}$, is enough to calculate the components of the velocity field [via (44)] and then the pressure field [via (31)]. In practice, the manipulations are extremely tedious. We therefore used the commercially available symbolic computation software, Mathematica [18]. The form of the resulting expressions are not particularly illuminating. Nevertheless, for completeness, we state the final expression for

the drag coefficient at second order below. (The reader is reminded that, due to the complexity of the function Φ, this expression must be calculated numerically).

$$\lambda^{(2)} = \frac{\eta\,\pi}{4\,\mathcal{C}\,l^2\left[K_1\left(a/l\right)\right]^2}\Bigg\{3\,a^2\,\mathcal{C}\left[K_0\left(a/l\right)\right]^2 + a^2\,\mathcal{C}\left[K_2\left(a/l\right)\right]^2 + 12\,a\,l\left(\mathcal{C}+2\right)K_0\left(a/l\right)K_1\left(a/l\right) + \left[K_1\left(a/l\right)\right]^2\left[4\left(a^2\,\mathcal{C}+3\,l^2\left(4+\mathcal{C}\right)\right) + \frac{\mathcal{C}\,l^2}{V}\int_a^\infty\left[7\xi^2 - 3\,a^2 - \xi^2\,\log\left(\xi/a\right)\right]\,\Phi(\xi)\,d\xi\right]\Bigg\}. \tag{77}$$